

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 9-17, 20-28, 31-39, and 42-44 are pending in the present application with claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 being the independent claims. Claims 46-60 have been withdrawn. Claims 1, 12, 23, 27, 28, and 34 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

In the final rejection dated January 28, 2010, claims 1-6, 9-17, 20-28, 31-39, and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims consistent with the following remarks.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Supervisory Patent Examiner Wu and Examiner McDowell for conducting an interview with applicants' undersigned representative on April 15, 2010. Applicants' representative and the examiners discussed the subject matter of the claims, proposed claim amendments, and the cited art. Applicants set forth below a summary of the arguments presented in the interview.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C §103

In the final rejection, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 12, 13, 15-17, 20, 23, 24, 26-28, 31, 34, 35, 37-39, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0021278 filed by Hinckley *et al.* (hereinafter "Hinckley") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0198029 filed by Tenhunen *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as "Tenhunen"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

While applicants maintain the arguments and traversals set forth in previous responses, in the interest of furthering prosecution, independent claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the claimed subject matter. Claim 1 recites "***configuring a first logical button from among said logical buttons to execute, upon activation of the first logical button, one of a first command call and a second command call at the computing device***" and "automatically logically remapping the commands to the logical buttons based on the second orientation of the images presented on the display by ***configuring a second logical button from among said logical buttons to execute, upon activation of the second logical button,***

one of the first command call and the second command call.” Applicants assert that these elements of claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited art.

The final rejection asserts that Tenhunan, at figures 1a-c and paragraph [0019], discloses automatically logically remapping commands to logical buttons based on the second orientation of images presented on a display. While these sections describe and illustrate remapping keypad cues based on a rotation of the device on which such cues are displayed, the keypads and/or the associated keypad cues are not configured to execute a plurality of command calls. Thus, Tenhunen cannot be said to disclose or suggest configuring a first logical button from among said logical buttons to execute, upon activation of the first logical button, one of a first command call and a second command call at the computing device or remapping the commands to the logical buttons based on the second orientation of the images presented on the display by configuring a second logical button from among said logical buttons to execute, upon activation of the second logical button, one of the first command call and the second command call.

Hinckley fails to cure this deficiency of Tenhunen. The cited sections Hinckley (figures 10 and 11 and paragraphs [0072] and [0073]) disclose detecting a change in the physical orientation of a device and displaying an image on the device in an orientation that matches the orientation of the device. Thus, Hinckley cannot be said to disclose or suggest configuring a first logical button from among said logical buttons to execute, upon activation of the first logical button, one of a first command call and a second command call at the computing device or remapping the commands to the logical buttons based on the second orientation of the images presented on the display by configuring a second logical button from among said logical buttons to execute, upon activation of the second logical button, one of the first command call and the second command call.

Because neither Tenhunan nor Hinckley disclose or suggest configuring a first logical button to execute one of a first command call and a second command call and remapping logical buttons by configuring a second logical button one of the first command call and the second command call, Tenhunan and Hinckley, taken individually or together, cannot be said to disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 1. For similar reasons, Tenhunan and Hinckley cannot be said to disclose or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 12,

23, and 34. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants acknowledge that the final rejection asserts additional grounds for rejection of the claims that are dependent upon claims 1, 12, 23, and 34. However, in view of the traversals set forth with respect to the independent claims, applicants believe that all such dependent claims are in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependence upon independent claim 1, 12, 23, and 34, rendering the rejections of those claims moot. Moreover, applicants submit that the remaining claims recite features that provide a separate basis for patentability. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of all claims that depend from independent claims 1, 12, 23, and 34. Applicants reserve the right to challenge the rejection of any of those dependent claims in any future response that may be forthcoming.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that this application, including claims 1-6, 9-17, 20-28, 31-39, and 42-44 is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 26, 2010

/Aaron F. Bourgeois/
Aaron F. Bourgeois
Registration No. 57,936

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439